

O

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 Vitalix S.A. DE C.V.,) CV 10-00556 RSWL (RCx)
12)
13 Plaintiff,) ORDER re: Plaintiff
14) Vitalix's Counsels'
15 v.) Motion to Withdraw [56]
16)
17 Grupo Carossi Sociedad)
18 Anonima, et al.,)
19)
20 Defendants.)

21 Plaintiff's Counsel, Adorno Yoss Alvarado & Smith,
22 APC, filed its Motion to Withdraw [56] on October 22,
23 2010. The matter was originally set for hearing on
24 November 23, 2010. Having taken the matter under
25 submission on November 16, 2010, and having reviewed
26 all papers submitted pertaining to this motion, the
27 Court **NOW FINDS AND RULES AS FOLLOWS:**

28 Plaintiff's Counsels' Motion is hereby **DENIED.**

A motion to withdraw as counsel may only be made

1 upon "written notice given reasonably in advance to the
2 client" because the client will be forced to proceed
3 pro se. L.R. 83-2.9.2.1. Moreover, because a
4 corporation may not appear in any action or proceeding
5 pro se, an attorney seeking to withdraw from corporate
6 representation must give notice to the corporation of
7 "the consequences of its inability to appear pro se."
8 L.R. 83-2.9.2.3; see also Urethane Foam Experts, Inc.
9 v. Latimer, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 404 (1995).

10 As Plaintiff's Counsels have not indicated that
11 proper notice has been given to their client, the Court
12 finds that allowing withdrawal of Plaintiff's Counsels
13 at this time would prejudice Plaintiff Vitalix.
14 Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Counsels'
15 Motion to Withdraw at this time.

16
17
18 DATED: November 24, 2010

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20 RONALD S.W. LEW

21 HONORABLE RONALD S.W. LEW
22 Senior, U.S. District Court Judge
23
24
25
26
27
28